Appl. No.: 10/720,023 Amdt. dated 02/12/2007

Reply to Office action of October 10, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated October 10, 2006. Filed concurrently herewith is a petition for a one month extension. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's thorough examination of the application as evidenced by the Office Action

Prior to the issuance of the present Office Action, Claims 5-16 were pending. Applicant has amended Claims 8 and 9 to expedite prosecution and to further clarify the claimed inventions. Claims 5-16 remain pending in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that pending Claims 5-16 are patentable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present claims in light of the following remarks.

<u>Claim Objections</u>On Page 2 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has identified a typographical error in Claim 9. In particular, the term "or" in Claim 9 should be replaced with the term "of." An appropriate correction has been made in this response and the Applicant respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

As provided in Section 2131 of the MPEP: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Mann* (US Patent 5,514,081). However, *Mann* does not disclose each limitation recited in amended Claim 11. For example, *Mann* does not disclose the Appl. No.: 10/720,023 Amdt. dated 02/12/2007

Reply to Office action of October 10, 2006

limitation of "said inflatable member tends to <u>increase</u> tension in said retention member such that

said limb is urged towards said structural body portion in such a manner as to result in flexion or extension of said joint? as recited in Claim 11. Instead, the straps identified by the Examiner in

the Mann patent merely allow a user to set the elbow in one of a variety of fixed positions. (See

the *Mann* patent merely allow a user to set the elbow in one of a variety of fixed positions. (See Col. 4, lines 23-25). Fig. 14 also illustrates that the arm of the user is extended flush against the

exoskeleton frame 76 prior to attachment of the straps 92, 94. Thus, the flexion of the arm

occurs without interaction with the frame 76 or the straps 92, 94. Accordingly, the device

disclosed in Mann does not satisfy the limitation of "said inflatable member tends to increase

tension in said retention member such that said limb is urged towards said structural body

portion in such a manner as to result in flexion or extension of said joint" recited in Claim 11.

Because Mann does not disclose or suggest each limitation of Claim 11, the Applicants request

the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes that the Examiner has indicated that Claims 5-10, and 12-16 are allowed.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed October 10, 2006. The foregoing amendment to Claim 11, when taken in conjunction with the

appended remarks, is believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance.

and such action is respectfully requested.

7 of 8

Appl. No.: 10/720,023 Amdt. dated 02/12/2007

Reply to Office action of October 10, 2006

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

> spectfully submitted. ev A. Cooper gistration No. 54,757

Customer No. 00826 ALSTON & BIRD LLP Bank of America Plaza

101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000

Charlotte, NC 28280-4000

Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000 Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777 CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being filed via the Electronic Filing System (EFS) to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Shana Moore

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON February 12, 2007.